

MEDICAL.



A natural flow of bile from the liver is essential to good health. When this is obstructed it results in:

BILIOUSNESS,

which, if neglected, soon leads to serious diseases. Simmons' Liver Regulator exerts a most beneficial influence over every working organ, regulates the secretion of bile and puts the digestive organs in such condition that they can do their best work. After taking this medicine no one will say, "I am bilious."

"I have been subject to severe spells of Congestion of the liver, and have been in the habit of taking from 15 to 20 grains of calomel, which generally did me up for three or four days. Lately I have been taking Simmons' Liver Regulator, which gave me relief without any interruption to business."—J. H. Hume, Mississippi, Ohio.

ONLY GENUINE
has on Z stamp in red on front of Wrapper

J. H. Zella & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
J. H. Zella & Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

DRS. BETTS & BETTS.
334 Whitehall Street.



DEBILITY, SPERMATORRHOEA, SEMI-LOSS OF VITALITY, NEURALGIA, MIGRAINE, LOSS OF MEMORY, CONFUSION OF IDEAS, HEADACHE, EYES, LASSITUDE, LANGOR, GLOOMINESS, DEPRESSION OF SPIRITS, AFFECTED, EASILY DISCOURAGED, LACK OF CONFIDENCE, DULL LISTLESS, DUFFY, SHY OF BUSINESS, AND FINDS LIFE A BURDEN. SAFELY, PERMANENTLY AND PRIVATELY CURED.

BLOOD & SKIN. Diseases, Syphilis, a disease most horrible in its results—completely eradicated without the use of mercury. Scarcely a day passes but some blotches, pimples, ulcers, pains in the head and bones, Syphilis, sore throat, mouth and tongue, glandular enlargement of the neck, Rheumatism, Catarrh, etc. ARE PERMANENTLY CURED WHEN OTHERS HAVE FAILED.

URINARY. Kidney and Bladder Troubles, Frequency of Urinating, Urine High colored or milky sediment on standing, Gonorrhea, Gleet, Stricture, etc. promptly and safely cured. Charges reasonable.

PRIVATE DISEASES. Blood Poison, Venereal Taint, Gleet, Stricture, Seminal Emissions, Loss of Sexual Power, Weakness of Sexual Organs, Want of Desire in male or female, whether from impure habits of young or old, or from any cause that degrades the sexual system. Consultation free and strictly confidential. Absolute cure guaranteed. No risk incurred. Correspondence promptly answered. Address sent free from observation to all parts of the United States. Consultation free. Office hours, 8 a. m. to 6 p. m. Sundays, 9 a. m. to 12 m. Correspondence receives prompt attention. No letters answered unless accompanied by four cents in stamps. Send stamp for 64 page pamphlet and list of questions. Address plainly.

DRS. BETTS & BETTS,
334 Whitehall St., ATLANTA, GA.

D. C. Bacon, Pres. M. F. Amos, Gen. Mgr.

ATLANTA LUMBER COMPANY.

YARDS, MILLS, On Line C. R. & E. T. V. & G. Ry. & G. Ry.

Long Leaf Pine, KILN-DRY DRESSED FLOORING, CEILING, WEATHERBOARDING, SHINGLES AND LATHS, BRIDGE AND TRUSSEL TIMBERS.

Best in quality, lowest in price. Write for estimates on house bills. sep16 2p n m

WILLINGHAM & CO.

ARE THE LARGEST
"LUMBER"
dealers in the city. Send your orders for Yellow Pine, rough or dressed, Poplar and Oak, Sash, Doors and Blinds, etc. to
WILLINGHAM & CO., Elliott Street.
1020—J. H. Zella & Co. Lumber Co.

ARARECHANCE

THE HEALTH OF THE SUBSCRIBER BEING such that he wishes to give up business, offers the stock, tools and good will of his

Book Bindery For Sale.

Would sell at a bargain for cash. He has the best selected stock of tools in the south—everything that is needed, nothing superfluous—with an assortment of material for every description of work.

R. J. MAYNARD,
Broad Street, Atlanta, Ga.

ARTISTS & PAINTERS' MATERIALS.

Lubricating Oils, Colors, Varnishes, BRUSHES.

WINDOW GLASS, ETC.

A. P. TRIPPO

45 Decatur Street, ATLANTA, GA.

THE BRADY BILL

Will be Reported Adversely by the Agricultural Committee.

FAVORABLE REPORT OF THE DEAN BILL

The Lunatic Asylum Investigation Discussed in the House—What Was Done in the Senate—Work of Committees.

The principal feature of yesterday's work in the legislature was the discussion on the reformatory prison bill, which is given in full in another column. In the house some time was devoted to the discussion of the Lunatic Asylum.

Mr. Stewart, of Rockdale, moved to reconsider the action of the house in adopting the resolution to appoint a committee to investigate the state lunatic asylum, saying that the resolution was never submitted to the committee on lunatic asylum.

"That committee has had under advisement," he said, "the appointment of a subcommittee to investigate the asylum. It was contemplated to make that investigation during the recess, but circumstances beyond the control of members prevented. That committee is a strong and good committee, composed of twenty-five or thirty good men. They are competent to conduct the investigation, and the introduction of the resolution was discourteous to them, to say the least. The resolution should be reconsidered and the bill referred to that committee. They will certainly send a committee to investigate, and, if necessary, clothe them with ample powers to take testimony. I trust that there will be no member of the house who is not a friend to the asylum. That resolution is a reflection upon the memory of the late Colonel L. N. Whittle, whose honor was above reproach."

MR. KENAN SPEAKS.
"It is with great reluctance that I take the floor," began Mr. Kenan. "I have been twenty days on the committee on lunatic asylum to meet. The superintendent of the asylum, who has been in the city or at Salt Springs for three or four weeks, has had ample time to come before the committee."

"The fact that a man is a friend to an institution often puts him in opposition to the management of that institution. I find evidence at the man who says that I am not a friend of the asylum. Let the dead bury the dead. Colonel Whittle is on record and his memory must stand by the consequences."

"This house has waited patiently for nine months for a report from that committee. The committee has not reported. It was the merest sham, the biggest blotch imaginable. The report of the committee was never submitted to the committee, but never been introduced by it, nor will it ever be."

DEMANDS INVESTIGATION.
With eleven or twelve officers at stated salaries, the expenses in other departments have not been steadily increasing, while salaries have not.

In 1877 \$10,000 was credited to salaries and \$24,000 to wages; in 1878 salaries were only \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1880 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1881 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1882 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1883 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1884 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1885 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1886 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1887 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1888 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1889 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1890 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1891 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1892 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1893 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1894 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1895 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1896 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1897 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1898 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1899 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1900 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1901 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1902 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1903 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1904 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1905 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1906 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1907 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1908 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1909 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1910 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1911 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1912 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1913 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1914 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1915 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1916 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1917 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1918 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1919 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1920 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1921 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1922 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1923 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1924 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1925 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1926 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1927 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1928 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1929 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1930 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1931 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1932 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1933 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1934 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1935 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1936 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1937 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1938 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1939 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1940 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1941 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1942 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1943 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1944 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1945 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1946 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1947 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1948 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1949 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1950 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1951 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1952 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1953 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1954 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1955 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1956 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1957 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1958 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1959 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1960 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1961 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1962 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1963 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1964 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1965 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1966 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1967 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1968 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1969 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1970 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1971 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1972 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1973 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1974 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1975 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1976 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1977 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1978 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1979 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1980 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1981 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1982 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1983 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1984 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1985 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1986 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1987 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1988 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1989 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1990 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1991 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1992 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1993 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1994 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1995 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1996 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1997 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1998 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 1999 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2000 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2001 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2002 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2003 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2004 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2005 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2006 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2007 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2008 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2009 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2010 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2011 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2012 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2013 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2014 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2015 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2016 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2017 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2018 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2019 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2020 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2021 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2022 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2023 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2024 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2025 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2026 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2027 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2028 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2029 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2030 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2031 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2032 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2033 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2034 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2035 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2036 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2037 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2038 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2039 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2040 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2041 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2042 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2043 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2044 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2045 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2046 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2047 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2048 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2049 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2050 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2051 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2052 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2053 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2054 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2055 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2056 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2057 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2058 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2059 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2060 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2061 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2062 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2063 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2064 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2065 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2066 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2067 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2068 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2069 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2070 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2071 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2072 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2073 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2074 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2075 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2076 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2077 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2078 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2079 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2080 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2081 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2082 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2083 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2084 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2085 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2086 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2087 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2088 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2089 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2090 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2091 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2092 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2093 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2094 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2095 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2096 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2097 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2098 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2099 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2100 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2101 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2102 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2103 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2104 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2105 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2106 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2107 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2108 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2109 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2110 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2111 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2112 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2113 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2114 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2115 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2116 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2117 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2118 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2119 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2120 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2121 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2122 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2123 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2124 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2125 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2126 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2127 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2128 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2129 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2130 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2131 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2132 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2133 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2134 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2135 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2136 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2137 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2138 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2139 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2140 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2141 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2142 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2143 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2144 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2145 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2146 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2147 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2148 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2149 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2150 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2151 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2152 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2153 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2154 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2155 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2156 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2157 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2158 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2159 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2160 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2161 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2162 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2163 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2164 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2165 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2166 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2167 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2168 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2169 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2170 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2171 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2172 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2173 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2174 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2175 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2176 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2177 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2178 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2179 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2180 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2181 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2182 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2183 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2184 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2185 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2186 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2187 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2188 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2189 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2190 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2191 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2192 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2193 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2194 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2195 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2196 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2197 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2198 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2199 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2200 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2201 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2202 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2203 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2204 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2205 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2206 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2207 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2208 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2209 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2210 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2211 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2212 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2213 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2214 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2215 salaries were \$10,000, while wages were \$24,000; in 2216 salaries were \$10,000, while

THE CONSTITUTION:
Published Daily and Weekly

THE DAILY CONSTITUTION
Is delivered by carriers in the city, or mailed postage free, at \$1.00 per month, \$2.50 for three months, or \$10.00 a year.

THE WEEKLY CONSTITUTION
(Circulation over 110,000) is mailed, post-paid, for \$1.25 a year, or for \$1.00 in clubs of five or more. Address all letters to
THE CONSTITUTION,
Atlanta, Georgia.

ATLANTA, GA., AUGUST 5, 1887.

A Question of Leadership.

The Louisville Courier-Journal says that as the course of Mr. Randall has increased the republican majority in Pennsylvania to 80,000, nobody cares whether the democrats of that state hold a convention or not.

It is true that the democrats of Pennsylvania are in the minority, but on that account they deserve all the more honor for the perfect organization which they have preserved after successive defeats, and for the enthusiastic courage with which they go into every campaign. A gammer set of democrats cannot be found in any United States, nor has the democratic party of any state an abler or more trusted leader than Samuel J. Randall.

It is not true that the democrats have lost strength in Pennsylvania. They manage to send eight good democrats to congress. They keep stout hearts and are always ready to contest for the most impregnable of republican strongholds.

But where would the democrats of Pennsylvania be had they followed Mr. Morrison, or Mr. Carlisle, or Mr. Watterson instead of Mr. Randall? The last man on earth who should now raise the question of decreased democratic strength is a Kentucky free trader.

The state election of last Monday has a lesson which cannot fail to impress even the so-called leaders of the Kentucky democracy. A state, which only a few years ago was good for from 75,000 to 100,000 democratic majority, is now claimed by the republicans. Though the democratic ticket has squeezed in by an uncomfortably small majority, it has a minority of the votes cast at the late election.

There has been no change in the attitude of the two great parties since Kentucky used to roll up her great democratic majorities. Those majorities have dwindled and almost disappeared because the men who are supposed to speak for the democracy in that state have driven off votes by their wild theories and their reckless disregard of the signs of the times.

Mr. Carlisle's own district, which was not long ago democratic by 5,000 majority, at the last election chose that very distinguished democrat by only 700 majority. With these facts staring them in the face, it is inconceivable that the mismanagers of the battered and crippled Kentucky democracy can have the assurance to arraign anybody for damage to the party.

Just at this time, for the free trade statesmen of Kentucky to be criticizing the Pennsylvania democrats for mismanagement, is an exhibition of gall which probably cannot be matched outside of the glorious land of blue grass and sour mash.

A Ridiculous British Scare.

The defeat in the house of commons, the other day, of the bill authorizing the construction of a tunnel under the English channel might have been expected.

The idea of connecting France and England by a tunnel is as old as the hills. The project is perfectly feasible. The difficulties in the way are certainly no greater than those encountered in boring Mount Cenis.

Yet the enterprise has never won any great degree of favor in England. Time and again bills have been introduced authorizing the work, but parliament invariably gives the scheme a black eye.

Ludicrous as it may appear, the Britishers have never entirely recovered from their dread of a French invasion, and in their eyes a tunnel would increase the danger of such a misfortune. To this day old men and women talk about the dark days when Napoleon's immense fleet menaced the security of the island. The incident figures in novels and stories, and the belief that the great Frenchman actually landed on the English coast still disturbs the British mind.

Now, it is absurd to suppose that a vast host of Frenchmen would be able to rush through the tunnel and take the island by surprise, and yet men shake their heads doubtfully, and say that it is safer not to run such a risk. The common people are almost solidly opposed to the project. They would not be able to sleep in their beds if they knew that a highway under the sea had been opened between the two countries.

Apart from its great commercial value the tunnel would doubtless bring the two nations into more intimate and cordial relations. It is a pity to see such a magnificent work sacrificed on account of stupid prejudices and equally stupid fears, but there is little hope of a change in English public opinion for some time to come.

"SIMOLEONS" is the Cincinnati word for money.

In the midst of such gibberish as this it is no wonder that the democrats sell out. It is a wonder that they don't move off.

Too Much of a Good Thing.

Professor Sumner's article in the North American Review on "The Extension of State Interference," foreshadows some of the governmental evils of the future.

Herbert Spencer in his paper on "The New Slavery," and Robert Louis Stevenson in his article on "The Day After Tomorrow," expressed substantially the same views that Professor Sumner now puts forth.

The drift of the age is towards paternalism and socialism. The state is called upon to do everything. It takes the private business of its citizens and regulates it, as in the case of the railroads. It educates the children, and interferes in the matter of the moral morals. Individual rights are no longer respected and the will of the majority is rapidly becoming oppressive and tyrannical.

Of course Professor Sumner makes a point against sumptuary laws, but he admits that such laws sometimes protect society. One thing in this connection is a little remarkable. The good people who march

up to the polls and by their votes sweep away a man's business and render his property valueless, are doing a great deal to strengthen Henry George's anti-poverty society, and the whole gang of communists. When George's followers get ready for their revolution they will turn upon the sumptuary reformers and say: "You do not hesitate to vote away the business and property of others when you are in the majority. Now we propose to do the same thing, only instead of annihilating property we shall simply divide it out."

The startled sumptuary men will reply that what they did was in the interest of society, but the communists will retort that they are working for the good of the greatest number, and then the two sides will have to fight it out, either at the polls or in some other way.

It is well enough for thoughtful men like Professor Sumner to sound the alarm. While the progress of paternalism and socialism may not be effectually checked, something may be done to retard it and stave off the worst evils. If the rule of the mob must come let us postpone it as long as possible.

BROTHER WATSON must hurry back to his loved Kentucky. In parts of the state there appears to be a sort of sinking sensation.

The logic of the Chicago Inter-Ocean appears to be getting a little worse for wear, which is a perfectly natural result, considering that the editor is always in an inflamed state of mind, and continually suffering from the effects of a rhetorical hot box. Here is an example:

The politicians of Georgia think they can afford to do this (make it a crime to teach negroes). If they do they will find that they have made a terrible blunder. The stigma will not soon wear the last of it. It is too late in the advancement of the world's civilization for such a sentiment as such a law as this to seem to be anything other than barbaric, infamous, a burning disgrace to any government this side of the kingdom of Dahomey.

This is foolish to the verge of wildness. There is no intention on the part of Georgia to make it a crime to teach negroes; on the contrary, the negroes of Georgia have equal educational facilities with the whites. If we take into consideration the negro institutions around Atlanta, their educational facilities are far superior to those of the whites.

But the people of the state insist that the education of the two races shall proceed separately. The Glenn bill has been described as a political firebrand, and THE CONSTITUTION has insisted that it is an unnecessary measure, but it represents the public sentiment of the state so far as the co-education of the races is concerned.

A great many generations will rise and pass away before there will be any mixed schools in Georgia.

The republican campaign in Ohio is to be run on a high moral basis. It is already given out that Powell, the democratic candidate for governor, has fits, and that the Thurman letter is a forgery. These discoveries have been made by that well-known confederate colonel, the Hon. Frederick D. Mussey.

Will the Mormons Reform?
It is whispered in Utah that Mormonism is about to undergo a great change.

While Taylor lived there was no hope of getting rid of polygamy. The old man had a large family of wives. He could not be expected to rudely upset the traditions of his church.

But with his successor it may be different. Suppose, for instance, a man like Brigham Young, Jr., should have been made the head of the church. Brigham is in sympathy with the younger element and he would naturally desire to enjoy some of the benefits of civilization instead of hiding out in the mountains all the time. Polygamy never was compulsory, and it would be easy enough to have a new revelation doing away with it entirely. The Mormons would then be at liberty to enjoy their religion without molestation. They have always prospered and they would doubtless continue to prosper.

It will be a strong temptation to Taylor's successor to begin his work as a reformer by modernizing his church and getting rid of all the uncomfortable customs which have become penal offenses under the Edmunds bill.

Would such a reformation destroy the Mormon church? In all probability it would not. With their strong organization it is not likely that there will be any sudden breaking up. Civilization and the drift of immigration may finally sweep away Mormonism, but such a result cannot come all at once. It will be a gradual movement running through at least one or two generations.

The natural successor of the dead Mormon president is eighty years of age. If there ever was an officer for which age disqualifies a man, this Mormon presidency is certainly the office.

As to the Results of the War.

The hot season is supposed to be the silly season. Just why this should be the case we have no means of knowing; but a fact is no less a fact because it has some element of mystery behind it. We mention this as a sort of preface to the following elaborate and roundabout inquiry from Senator Hawley's Hartford Courant:

We should like to ask our contemporaries, any of the able, reasonable, patriotic newspapers, such as the Charleston News, THE ATLANTA CONSTITUTION, the Memphis Appeal and Avalanche, the Louisville Courier-Journal, the Mobile Register, the New Orleans Democrat, or the Houston Post, or any other first-class southern journal, that might be named, one question. Not by way of agitation, but out of curiosity, and because in his slack reason it is a good time to settle some theories. Would our contemporaries call an attempt at secession, accompanied with an attack on federal property made, treason against the United States?

We have no doubt of the entire loyalty (meaning fidelity to the United States as a nation) of the inhabitants of the late confederate states. We believe that pride in the union and the disposition to fight for its honor and integrity is common to all the people. That is not called in question anywhere. We have one flag and one country and all that. Difference of opinion as to whether whites or blacks should rule in any locality has nothing to do with union sentiment.

But this is the point: Before the war a great number of the people in the south (not all) and a few in the north held the theory that the union of the states was only a compact which might be broken at any time, and that, therefore, secession, accompanied and leaving war to secure it was not treason.

A majority at the north and many people at the south held the opposite theory that we are a nation, both by compact and by historic growth, and that any attack upon the integrity of the nation was a treason against the nation.

In the progress of events after Sumner, pretty much all of the north opposed the national theory.

After drawing a very long breath, we are prepared to say that the secession movement which resulted in the war was not treason because it had been discussed as a policy both by the north and the south. Anti-slavery men as well as pro-slavery men believed in its efficacy, and some very prominent abolitionists were in favor of allowing the erring states of the south to go in peace.

LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE.

A Home for Soldiers.

EDITORIAL CONSTITUTION: The writer was very forcibly impressed today with the necessity of a home for soldiers in Georgia—an old, disabled colored man of the confederate army, penniless, seeking the assistance of friends to get out of town. This man has a record for his bravery, honesty and independence, and for him now to suffer the humiliation of the north, and to be dependent on the charity of the south, is almost a living death to him, and requires bravery of a very peculiar kind to live and face the world and be a soldier's home.

The question is, taking the nation and the theory of the constitution as the war has settled it, would it be in violation of our constitution, to treat to the union now to repeat the performance of 1861?

After drawing a very long breath, we are prepared to say that the secession movement which resulted in the war was not treason because it had been discussed as a policy both by the north and the south. Anti-slavery men as well as pro-slavery men believed in its efficacy, and some very prominent abolitionists were in favor of allowing the erring states of the south to go in peace.

The war has settled this matter, and its extent—that secession is rebellion, and its revolution is unsuccessful it is rebellion. As to the secession of the future, we may be permitted to remark that it will originate in the New England states, and in the case of the south and southern troops will be found ready and anxious to put it down.

Dr. Hawthorne and Dr. Strong.
EDITORIAL CONSTITUTION: While I was glad to see Dr. Hawthorne's prompt denial, in yesterday's CONSTITUTION, of the charge of plagiarizing Dr. Strong's book, I will be still better satisfied if it is explained why it was that the verbiage was changed, if, as the doctor says, he used quotation marks. If it was intended to give Dr. Strong's ideas, with due credit, why were his words twisted into the formation of new sentences of the verbiage? To have "quoted" this transformation would have been an injustice to Dr. Strong. As a citizen, I merely avail myself of referring to the matter, which the public in general are entitled to know. Dr. Hawthorne can make a satisfactory explanation.

Build Better Bridges.
EDITORIAL CONSTITUTION: There is a lesson to be learned from this freshet, and I want THE CONSTITUTION to call attention to it—i. e., the necessity of building bridges over the water courses of the state. The water courses are in a state of ruin, and it is undoubtedly true that twelve inches of rain will raise our streams much higher than twelve inches did twenty years ago.

The old high water marks of the Harlow freshet are no longer safe guides. If this matter is borne in mind by builders of mills and bridges, it will save the state great loss in the future. It is not a matter of a few feet, but it will continue to grow worse for some years to come, for land in this portion of the state is being elevated on a more and more rapid scale, and it is clear, I think, that in the future time will doubtless see a large part of the water courses of the state in a state of ruin, which will retard the flow of the water almost as well as the original freshet.

There is no intention on the part of Georgia to make it a crime to teach negroes; on the contrary, the negroes of Georgia have equal educational facilities with the whites. If we take into consideration the negro institutions around Atlanta, their educational facilities are far superior to those of the whites.

But the people of the state insist that the education of the two races shall proceed separately. The Glenn bill has been described as a political firebrand, and THE CONSTITUTION has insisted that it is an unnecessary measure, but it represents the public sentiment of the state so far as the co-education of the races is concerned.

A great many generations will rise and pass away before there will be any mixed schools in Georgia.

The republican campaign in Ohio is to be run on a high moral basis. It is already given out that Powell, the democratic candidate for governor, has fits, and that the Thurman letter is a forgery. These discoveries have been made by that well-known confederate colonel, the Hon. Frederick D. Mussey.

Will the Mormons Reform?
It is whispered in Utah that Mormonism is about to undergo a great change.

While Taylor lived there was no hope of getting rid of polygamy. The old man had a large family of wives. He could not be expected to rudely upset the traditions of his church.

But with his successor it may be different. Suppose, for instance, a man like Brigham Young, Jr., should have been made the head of the church. Brigham is in sympathy with the younger element and he would naturally desire to enjoy some of the benefits of civilization instead of hiding out in the mountains all the time. Polygamy never was compulsory, and it would be easy enough to have a new revelation doing away with it entirely. The Mormons would then be at liberty to enjoy their religion without molestation. They have always prospered and they would doubtless continue to prosper.

It will be a strong temptation to Taylor's successor to begin his work as a reformer by modernizing his church and getting rid of all the uncomfortable customs which have become penal offenses under the Edmunds bill.

Would such a reformation destroy the Mormon church? In all probability it would not. With their strong organization it is not likely that there will be any sudden breaking up. Civilization and the drift of immigration may finally sweep away Mormonism, but such a result cannot come all at once. It will be a gradual movement running through at least one or two generations.

The natural successor of the dead Mormon president is eighty years of age. If there ever was an officer for which age disqualifies a man, this Mormon presidency is certainly the office.

As to the Results of the War.
The hot season is supposed to be the silly season. Just why this should be the case we have no means of knowing; but a fact is no less a fact because it has some element of mystery behind it. We mention this as a sort of preface to the following elaborate and roundabout inquiry from Senator Hawley's Hartford Courant:

We should like to ask our contemporaries, any of the able, reasonable, patriotic newspapers, such as the Charleston News, THE ATLANTA CONSTITUTION, the Memphis Appeal and Avalanche, the Louisville Courier-Journal, the Mobile Register, the New Orleans Democrat, or the Houston Post, or any other first-class southern journal, that might be named, one question. Not by way of agitation, but out of curiosity, and because in his slack reason it is a good time to settle some theories. Would our contemporaries call an attempt at secession, accompanied with an attack on federal property made, treason against the United States?

We have no doubt of the entire loyalty (meaning fidelity to the United States as a nation) of the inhabitants of the late confederate states. We believe that pride in the union and the disposition to fight for its honor and integrity is common to all the people. That is not called in question anywhere. We have one flag and one country and all that. Difference of opinion as to whether whites or blacks should rule in any locality has nothing to do with union sentiment.

But this is the point: Before the war a great number of the people in the south (not all) and a few in the north held the theory that the union of the states was only a compact which might be broken at any time, and that, therefore, secession, accompanied and leaving war to secure it was not treason.

A majority at the north and many people at the south held the opposite theory that we are a nation, both by compact and by historic growth, and that any attack upon the integrity of the nation was a treason against the nation.

In the progress of events after Sumner, pretty much all of the north opposed the national theory.

After drawing a very long breath, we are prepared to say that the secession movement which resulted in the war was not treason because it had been discussed as a policy both by the north and the south. Anti-slavery men as well as pro-slavery men believed in its efficacy, and some very prominent abolitionists were in favor of allowing the erring states of the south to go in peace.

The war has settled this matter, and its extent—that secession is rebellion, and its revolution is unsuccessful it is rebellion. As to the secession of the future, we may be permitted to remark that it will originate in the New England states, and in the case of the south and southern troops will be found ready and anxious to put it down.

Dr. Hawthorne and Dr. Strong.
EDITORIAL CONSTITUTION: While I was glad to see Dr. Hawthorne's prompt denial, in yesterday's CONSTITUTION, of the charge of plagiarizing Dr. Strong's book, I will be still better satisfied if it is explained why it was that the verbiage was changed, if, as the doctor says, he used quotation marks. If it was intended to give Dr. Strong's ideas, with due credit, why were his words twisted into the formation of new sentences of the verbiage? To have "quoted" this transformation would have been an injustice to Dr. Strong. As a citizen, I merely avail myself of referring to the matter, which the public in general are entitled to know. Dr. Hawthorne can make a satisfactory explanation.

Build Better Bridges.
EDITORIAL CONSTITUTION: There is a lesson to be learned from this freshet, and I want THE CONSTITUTION to call attention to it—i. e., the necessity of building bridges over the water courses of the state. The water courses are in a state of ruin, and it is undoubtedly true that twelve inches of rain will raise our streams much higher than twelve inches did twenty years ago.

The old high water marks of the Harlow freshet are no longer safe guides. If this matter is borne in mind by builders of mills and bridges, it will save the state great loss in the future. It is not a matter of a few feet, but it will continue to grow worse for some years to come, for land in this portion of the state is being elevated on a more and more rapid scale, and it is clear, I think, that in the future time will doubtless see a large part of the water courses of the state in a state of ruin, which will retard the flow of the water almost as well as the original freshet.

There is no intention on the part of Georgia to make it a crime to teach negroes; on the contrary, the negroes of Georgia have equal educational facilities with the whites. If we take into consideration the negro institutions around Atlanta, their educational facilities are far superior to those of the whites.

But the people of the state insist that the education of the two races shall proceed separately. The Glenn bill has been described as a political firebrand, and THE CONSTITUTION has insisted that it is an unnecessary measure, but it represents the public sentiment of the state so far as the co-education of the races is concerned.

A great many generations will rise and pass away before there will be any mixed schools in Georgia.

The republican campaign in Ohio is to be run on a high moral basis. It is already given out that Powell, the democratic candidate for governor, has fits, and that the Thurman letter is a forgery. These discoveries have been made by that well-known confederate colonel, the Hon. Frederick D. Mussey.

Will the Mormons Reform?
It is whispered in Utah that Mormonism is about to undergo a great change.

LETTERS FROM THE PEOPLE.

A Home for Soldiers.

EDITORIAL CONSTITUTION: The writer was very forcibly impressed today with the necessity of a home for soldiers in Georgia—an old, disabled colored man of the confederate army, penniless, seeking the assistance of friends to get out of town. This man has a record for his bravery, honesty and independence, and for him now to suffer the humiliation of the north, and to be dependent on the charity of the south, is almost a living death to him, and requires bravery of a very peculiar kind to live and face the world and be a soldier's home.

The question is, taking the nation and the theory of the constitution as the war has settled it, would it be in violation of our constitution, to treat to the union now to repeat the performance of 1861?

After drawing a very long breath, we are prepared to say that the secession movement which resulted in the war was not treason because it had been discussed as a policy both by the north and the south. Anti-slavery men as well as pro-slavery men believed in its efficacy, and some very prominent abolitionists were in favor of allowing the erring states of the south to go in peace.

The war has settled this matter, and its extent—that secession is rebellion, and its revolution is unsuccessful it is rebellion. As to the secession of the future, we may be permitted to remark that it will originate in the New England states, and in the case of the south and southern troops will be found ready and anxious to put it down.

Dr. Hawthorne and Dr. Strong.
EDITORIAL CONSTITUTION: While I was glad to see Dr. Hawthorne's prompt denial, in yesterday's CONSTITUTION, of the charge of plagiarizing Dr. Strong's book, I will be still better satisfied if it is explained why it was that the verbiage was changed, if, as the doctor says, he used quotation marks. If it was intended to give Dr. Strong's ideas, with due credit, why were his words twisted into the formation of new sentences of the verbiage? To have "quoted" this transformation would have been an injustice to Dr. Strong. As a citizen, I merely avail myself of referring to the matter, which the public in general are entitled to know. Dr. Hawthorne can make a satisfactory explanation.

Build Better Bridges.
EDITORIAL CONSTITUTION: There is a lesson to be learned from this freshet, and I want THE CONSTITUTION to call attention to it—i. e., the necessity of building bridges over the water courses of the state. The water courses are in a state of ruin, and it is undoubtedly true that twelve inches of rain will raise our streams much higher than twelve inches did twenty years ago.

The old high water marks of the Harlow freshet are no longer safe guides. If this matter is borne in mind by builders of mills and bridges, it will save the state great loss in the future. It is not a matter of a few feet, but it will continue to grow worse for some years to come, for land in this portion of the state is being elevated on a more and more rapid scale, and it is clear, I think, that in the future time will doubtless see a large part of the water courses of the state in a state of ruin, which will retard the flow of the water almost as well as the original freshet.

There is no intention on the part of Georgia to make it a crime to teach negroes; on the contrary, the negroes of Georgia have equal educational facilities with the whites. If we take into consideration the negro institutions around Atlanta, their educational facilities are far superior to those of the whites.

But the people of the state insist that the education of the two races shall proceed separately. The Glenn bill has been described as a political firebrand, and THE CONSTITUTION has insisted that it is an unnecessary measure, but it represents the public sentiment of the state so far as the co-education of the races is concerned.

A great many generations will rise and pass away before there will be any mixed schools in Georgia.

The republican campaign in Ohio is to be run on a high moral basis. It is already given out that Powell, the democratic candidate for governor, has fits, and that the Thurman letter is a forgery. These discoveries have been made by that well-known confederate colonel, the Hon. Frederick D. Mussey.

Will the Mormons Reform?
It is whispered in Utah that Mormonism is about to undergo a great change.

While Taylor lived there was no hope of getting rid of polygamy. The old man had a large family of wives. He could not be expected to rudely upset the traditions of his church.

But with his successor it may be different. Suppose, for instance, a man like Brigham Young, Jr., should have been made the head of the church. Brigham is in sympathy with the younger element and he would naturally desire to enjoy some of the benefits of civilization instead of hiding out in the mountains all the time. Polygamy never was compulsory, and it would be easy enough to have a new revelation doing away with it entirely. The Mormons would then be at liberty to enjoy their religion without molestation. They have always prospered and they would doubtless continue to prosper.

It will be a strong temptation to Taylor's successor to begin his work as a reformer by modernizing his church and getting rid of all the uncomfortable customs which have become penal offenses under the Edmunds bill.

Would such a reformation destroy the Mormon church? In all probability it would not. With their strong organization it is not likely that there will be any sudden breaking up. Civilization and the drift of immigration may finally sweep away Mormonism, but such a result cannot come all at once. It will be a gradual movement running through at least one or two generations.

The natural successor of the dead Mormon president is eighty years of age. If there ever was an officer for which age disqualifies a man, this Mormon presidency is certainly the office.

As to the Results of the War.
The hot season is supposed to be the silly season. Just why this should be the case we have no means of knowing; but a fact is no less a fact because it has some element of mystery behind it. We mention this as a sort of preface to the following elaborate and roundabout inquiry from Senator Hawley's Hartford Courant:

We should like to ask our contemporaries, any of the able, reasonable, patriotic newspapers, such as the Charleston News, THE ATLANTA CONSTITUTION, the Memphis Appeal and Avalanche, the Louisville Courier-Journal, the Mobile Register, the New Orleans Democrat, or the Houston Post, or any other first-class southern journal, that might be named, one question. Not by way of agitation, but out of curiosity, and because in his slack reason it is a good time to settle some theories. Would our contemporaries call an attempt at secession, accompanied with an attack on federal property made, treason against the United States?

We have no doubt of the entire loyalty (meaning fidelity to the United States as a nation) of the inhabitants of the late confederate states. We believe that pride in the union and the disposition to fight for its honor and integrity is common to all the people. That is not called in question anywhere. We have one flag and one country and all that. Difference of opinion as to whether whites or blacks should rule in any locality has nothing to do with union sentiment.

But this is the point: Before the war a great number of the people in the south (not all) and a few in the north held the theory that the union of the states was only a compact which might be broken at any time, and that, therefore, secession, accompanied and leaving war to secure it was not treason.

A majority at the north and many people at the south held the opposite theory that we are a nation, both by compact and by historic growth, and that any attack upon the integrity of the nation was a treason against the nation.

In the progress of events after Sumner, pretty much all of the north opposed the national theory.

After drawing a very long breath, we are prepared to say that the secession movement which resulted in the war was not treason because it had been discussed as a policy both by the north and the south. Anti-slavery men as well as pro-slavery men believed in its efficacy, and some very prominent abolitionists were in favor of allowing the erring states of the south to go in peace.

The war has settled this matter, and its extent—that secession is rebellion, and its revolution is unsuccessful it is rebellion. As to the secession of the future, we may be permitted to remark that it will originate in the New England states, and in the case of the south and southern troops will be found ready and anxious to put it down.

Dr. Hawthorne and Dr. Strong.
EDITORIAL CONSTITUTION: While I was glad to see Dr. Hawthorne's prompt denial, in yesterday's CONSTITUTION, of the charge of plagiarizing Dr. Strong's book, I will be still better satisfied if it is explained why it was that the verbiage was changed, if, as the doctor says, he used quotation marks. If it was intended to give Dr. Strong's ideas, with due credit, why were his words twisted into the formation of new sentences of the verbiage? To have "quoted" this transformation would have been an injustice to Dr. Strong. As a citizen, I merely avail myself of referring to the matter, which the public in general are entitled to know. Dr. Hawthorne can make a satisfactory explanation.

Build Better Bridges.
EDITORIAL CONSTITUTION: There is a lesson to be learned from this freshet, and I want THE CONSTITUTION to call attention to it—i. e., the necessity of building bridges over the water courses of the state. The water courses are in a state of ruin, and it is undoubtedly true that twelve inches of rain will raise our streams much higher than twelve inches did twenty years ago.

The old high water marks of the Harlow freshet are no longer safe guides. If this matter is borne in mind by builders of mills and bridges, it will save the state great loss in the future. It is not a matter of a few feet, but it will continue to grow worse for some years to come, for land in this portion of the state is being elevated on a more and more rapid scale, and it is clear, I think, that in the future time will doubtless see a large part of the water courses of the state in a state of ruin, which will retard the flow of the water almost as well as the original freshet.

There is no intention on the part of Georgia to make it a crime to teach negroes; on the contrary, the negroes of Georgia have equal educational facilities with the whites. If we take into consideration the negro institutions around Atlanta, their educational facilities are far superior to those of the whites.

But the people of the state insist that the education of the two races shall proceed separately. The Glenn bill has been described as a political firebrand, and THE CONSTITUTION has insisted that it is an unnecessary measure, but it represents the public sentiment of the state so far as the co-education of the races is concerned.

A great many generations will rise and pass away before there will be any mixed schools in Georgia.

The republican campaign in Ohio is to be run on a high moral basis. It is already given out that Powell, the democratic candidate for governor, has fits, and that the Thurman letter is a forgery. These discoveries have been made by that well-known confederate colonel, the Hon. Frederick D. Mussey.

Will the Mormons Reform?
It is whispered in Utah that Mormonism is about to undergo a great change.

INGERSOLL AND YOUNG MEN.

A Preacher Gives the Great Infidel Something to Think About.

From Letter to Colonel Robert G. Ingersoll, in North American Review, by Dr. Henry M. Field.
You feel strong in the strength of a robust manhood, well poised in body and mind, and in the center of a happy home, where loving hearts cling to you like vines around the oak. But many to whom you speak are quite otherwise. You address thousands of young men who have come out of country homes, where they have been brought up in the fear of God, and have heard the morning and evening prayer. They come into a city full of temptations, but are restrained from evil by the thought of father and mother, and reverence for Him who is the Father of us all—a feeling which, though it may not have taken the form of any profession, is yet at the bottom of their hearts, and keeps them from many a wrong and upward step. A young man who is thus "guarded and defended" as by unseen angels, some evening when he feels very lonely, is invited to "go and hear Ingersoll."

